DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 428 021 SO 029 952

AUTHOR	Friedman, Victor A.
TITLE	Educational Language Rights and Romani Participation in Macedonian Education.
PUB DATE	1998-00-00
NOTE	18p.
PUB TYPE	Historical Materials (060) -- Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Cultural Context; Diachronic Linguistics; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Language Minorities; *Language of Instruction; *Language Role; Social Studies; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	Educational Rights; *Macedonia; Political History; *Roma; Romany; Yugoslavia

ABSTRACT

In the complex ethnic mosaic of Macedonia, the Romani people (Roms) have maintained their separateness while at the same time functioning as an integral and accepted part of everyday Macedonian life. This paper reports that, although Roms seek to participate in Macedonian formal educational institutions using their own language, the Romani language itself is still in the process of the kind of standardization associated, among other things, with the institutionalized structures of formal education. The paper discusses the development of Romani language use in the Republic of Macedonia primarily in terms of its relation to education and other public and official contexts, utilizing both published sources and personal experiences during more than 20 years of field research in Macedonia. To frame these issues, the paper first turns to the statistical and legal position of the Roms in Macedonia and the former Yugoslavia. The paper points out that in 1990 the first item in the party platform of the Rom political organization, "The Party for the Complete Emancipation of the Roms," concerned education, while the third item concerned the Romani language. It notes that the establishment of Romani as a language of instruction did not envision a parallel education system but rather the teaching of Romani as a subject in elementary schools and pedagogical academies with a view to preparing teachers and, ultimately, a lectureship and Department of Romani at the University of Skopje. The paper concludes that, while Romani education in Macedonia is progressing slowly, it is nonetheless perceptibly progressing. (Contains 4 tables, 20 notes, and 94 references.) (BT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 428 021

Educational Language Rights and Romani Participation in Macedonian Education.

by Victor A. Friedman

SO 029 952

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Victor A. Friedman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U S DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Educational Language Rights and Romani Participation in Macedonian Education

Victor A. Friedman - University of Chicago*

An earlier version of this paper will be published as "The Romani Language in the Republic of Macedonia: Status, Usage, and Sociolinguistic Perspectives" in *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, 1998.

As an ethnic group in Macedonia, the Romani people have occupied a marginalized place similar to that in which they find themselves elsewhere in Europe, but with an important difference: While they have been subjected to discrimination (see Silverman 1995a, 1995b), they have not been the target of the kind of racist violence that has occurred and still occurs elsewhere in Europe (cf. Barany 1994, 1995, Kyuchukov 1995). In fact, in the complex ethnic mosaic of Macedonia, the Roms[1] have maintained their separateness while at the same time functioning as an integral and accepted part of everyday Macedonian life. Since the constitutional revisions of 1974, when the Roms received legal recognition as an ethnic collective, there have been various attempts to advance education in Romani -- educational linguistic rights being a cornerstone of identity politics. With the independence of the Republic of Macedonia, the Roms were recognized in the 1991 constitution as a *narodnost* 'nationality' on the same level as Albanians, Turks, Vlahs, and others (mainly Serbs). Although Roms seek to participate in formal educational institutions using their own language, however, the Romani language itself is still in the process of the kind of standardization associated, among other things, with the institutionalized structures of formal education. In this paper, I shall discuss the development of Romani language use in the Republic of Macedonia primarily in terms of its relation to education and other public and official contexts, utilizing both published sources and my own experiences during more than twenty years of field research in Macedonia. In order to frame these issues, I shall first turn to the statistical and legal position of the Roms in Macedonia and former Yugoslavia.

According to the 1994 census Roms constitute approximately 2.3% of the population of the Republic of Macedonia.[2] In former Yugoslavia, Roms constituted between 0.6% and 0.7% of the total population, approximately two thirds in the Republic of Serbia and about one quarter in the Republic of Macedonia. As can be seen from Tables One and Two, the figures on people declaring Romani nationality have varied considerably over the years. This is not due to changes in birth or death rates, since the Roms have a natality rate almost twice the Yugoslav average (Stanković 1992:173). While mechanical growth (migration) could account for some fluctuations, there were no migrations massive enough to account for these differences. Rather the magnitude of changes in the figures reflect differences in social

* I am grateful to the International Research and Exchanges Board, The National Endowment for the Humanities, the American Council of Learned Societies, the Ford Foundation, and the Institute for International Education (Fulbright-Hayes), and the American Philosophical Society, which have directly or indirectly supported my research in Macedonia during this time. I am particularly grateful to Šaip Jusuf, Trajko Petrovksi, Oskar Mamut, Guneš Mustafa, Šaip Isen, Ramo Rušidovski, Tahir Nuhi, Iliaz Zendel, Faik Abdi, Didar and Hajredin Šerif, Donald Kenrick, Ian Hancock, Thomas Acton, Marcel Cortiade, Yaron Matras, Peter Bakker, Anthony Grant, Carol Silverman, Christina Kramer, Wayles Browne, Marjan Markovič, Ognjan Tanevski, Krume Kepeski, Svetlana Antonovska, Olivera Jašar-Nasteva, Liljana Minova-Gurkova, Živko Cvetkovski, and Dimitar Mirčev all of whom have helped me in my research on Romani issues and none of whom are responsible for the opinions expressed here. Moreover, any errors are entirely my responsibility.

[1] See note at *Rom* in Table Two

[2] Romani ethnopoliticians have on occasion claimed as many as five times the official figures (Čangova 1991), and political leaders of all the other major ethnic groups inside Macedonia as well as politicians in neighboring states with histories of territorial claims against Macedonia have at one time or another claimed numbers as much as 60 times in excess of the 1994 census figures. The point is not one of statistical accuracy but rather claims to political power and hegemony (see Friedman 1996). Nonetheless, given the social stigma attached to Romani identity and the marginalized position of Roms in society, it is well known in demographic literature that Roms often choose to declare a different nationality (Stanković 1992:161). Another example of conflicting tensions was the appeal to Roms during the 1991 census to register as Roms and not as Albanians or Turks or "something else" out of fear or due to pressure (*Nova Makedonija* 28.III.91: 4). To the extent that the Macedonian government is seeking to reduce Albanian influence, this has led to increased recognition for both Roms and Macedonian Muslims.

pressure concerning the declaration of Romani as opposed to some other nationality. The tremendous drop in 1961 in the number of self-declared Roms in Serbia but not in Macedonia has been labeled a "statistical enigma" (Stanković 1992:160), but must clearly reflect a difference between either the censusing or social position (or both) of Roms in Serbia and in Macedonia.

TABLE CNE

	1981	1971	1961	1953	1948
Macedonia	43125=25.7%	24505=31.2%	20606=65%	20462=24.2%	19500=26.8%
Serbia	110959=66%	49894=63.6%	9826=31%	58800=69.5%	52181=71.8%

Figures concerning Romani nationality in Macedonian and Former Yugoslavia in the five uncontested post-war censuses Source: Stanković 1992

TABLE TWO

Declared Nationality (*narodnost*)	Census total by year, number, and percentage (rounded upward where necessary)													
	1948	%	1953	%	1961	%	1971	%	1981	%	1991	%	1994*	%
Macedonians	789548	68.5	860699	66.0	1000854	71.2	1142375	69.3	1279323	67.0	1328187	65.3	1295964	66.5
Albanians	197389	17.1	162524	12.4	183108	13.0	279871	17.0	377208	19.8	441987	21.7	441104	22.9
Turks	95940	8.3	203938	15.6	131481	9.4	108552	6.6	86591	4.5	77080	3.8	78019	4.0
Roms**	19500	1.7	20462	1.6	20606	1.5	24505	1.5	43125	2.3	52103	2.6	43707	2.3
Vlahs	9511	0.8	8668	0.6	8046	0.6	7190	0.6	6384	0.3	7764	0.4	8601	0.4
Serbs	29721	2.6	35112	2.7	42728	3	46465	2.8	44468	2.3	42775	2.1	40228	2.0
Muslims	1560	0.1	1591	0.1	3002	0.2	1248	0.1	39513	2.1	31356	1.5	15418	0.8
Bulgarians	889	0.1	920	0.1	3087	0.2	3334	0.2	1980	0.1	1370	0.0	1682	0.1
Greeks	-	-	848	0.1	836	0.1	536	0.0	707	0.1	474	0.0	368	0.0
Egyptian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3307	0.2	3080	0.2
Bosniac	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6829	0.4
Yugoslav	-	-	-	-	1260	0.1	3652	0.2	14225	0.7	15703	0.8	595***	0.0
Other****	8928	0.8	9752	0.8	10995	0.7	29580	1.7	15612	0.8	31858	1.6	9797	0.4
Total	1152986	100	1304514	100	1406003	100	1647308	100	1909136	100	2033964	100	1945932	100

The Ethnic Structure of the Republic of Macedonian since World War Two

Sources: Antonovska et al. 1991, 1994a, 1994b, 1996, Latifić et al. 1970, Pekevski et al. 1973, Savezni Zavod za Statistiku 1954, 1981.

Between the 1971 and 1981 censuses, there was a change in the legal status of Romani that both reflected and encouraged a rise in consciousness of Romani identity -- viz. the federal and republic constitutional reforms of 1974 in which Romani (along with Vlah) received the official status of *etnička grupa* 'ethnic group', a step below *narodnost* 'nationality' (the term

---

[3]The 1991 Yugoslav census was boycotted by part of the popultaion, mainly ethnic Albanians. Data for Table Two are based on Stanković (1992).

* According to Dr. Svetlana Antonovska (p.c. 95/05/25), Director of the Republic Bureau of Statistics, the lower figures for some nationalities in 1994 vs. 1991 is due to the fact that citizens living abroad for more than one year were included in the 1991 census, whereas in the 1994 census -- in accordance with international norms -- only those citizens living abroad for one year or less were counted. The figures cited for 1994 are based on preliminary results available as of this writing (April 1996). The Republic Bureau of Statistics is scheduled to meet with the Group of Experts 18-25 June 1996 to produce the final result, which will be published subsequently.

** The predominantly Romani-speaking ethnic group popularly known as ***Gypsies*** in English and ***Cigani*** in Macedonian (similar ethnonyms are used in most of the languages of Central and Eastern Europe) is now referred to by the native ethnonym ***Rom*** (singular) in scholarly literature as well as official documents in many countries. (The term was official in the 1971 Macedonian census.) Although in languages other than English this word has been unhesitatingly adapted to the grammar of the language in which it is used (e.g. Bulgarian, Macedonian, Romanian, Serbo-Croatian pl. ***Romi***, Albanian pl. ***Romë***), considerable inconsistency has arisen in English usage. Thus as the plural of ***Rom*** some scholars and other serious writers use the Romani form ***Roma***, others adapt the word to English morphology and write ***Roms***, others use a pluralized adjective ***Romanies***, and some use the Kalderash collective ***Rom*** for both singular and plural. I have argued elsewhere (Friedman and Hancock 1995) that just as in English the plural of ***Turk*** is ***Turks*** and not ***Turkler***, so the plural of ***Rom*** should be ***Roms*** and not ***Roma***. I would argue that the form ***Roma*** exoticizes and marginalizes rather than emphasizing the fact that the group in question is an ethnic group just as are ***Turks***, ***Magyars*** (not ***Magyarok***), ***Bulgars*** (not ***Bulgari***),etc.

*** This figure includes those who declared "Yugoslav" as well as nationalities not counted separately in the census, mostly from Africa, East Asia, and the Middle East (MIC 95/01/05).

**** Yugoslav and Macedonian censuses distinguished up to 34 nationality categories as well as several other types including those who declared a regional identity and those who did not declare a nationality. For the sake of conciseness, I have grouped all the smaller categories, none of which are relevant for this paper, under the designation Other. This designation includes the following specified groups: Austrian, English, Belgian, German, Danish, Jewish, Italian, Norwegian, Polish, Romanian, Russian, Rusyn, Slovak, Slovenian, Ukrainian, Hungarian, French, Dutch, Croatian, Montenegrin, Czech, Swiss and Swedish. This category also includes those who protested the use of nationality as a classification by making facetious declarations, among which the most popular were Lightbulb and Refrigerator (Robert Hayden, University of Pittsburgh, personal communication).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

which came to replace 'national minority' [Macedonian *nacionalno malcinstvo* Serbo-Croatian *nacionalna manjina*] during the 1960's and became official in the 1974 constitutions).[4] This rise in national consciousness was parallel with a rise in linguistic consciousness. It was during this period that the first serious attempts in the direction of Romani-language education were made in Macedonia.

In discussing the relationship of Romani language to Romani nationality, it is important to keep in mind that there is not an absolute one-to-one correspondence between the two. The figures in Table Three show the correlation between declared nationality and declared mother tongue for the first and last uncontested Yugoslav censuses conducted in Macedonia and the 1994 Macedonian census.

TABLE THREE - PART I (continued on next page)

1953

Declared Nationality	Declared Mother Tongue: Macedonian	Albanian	Turkish	Serbo-Croat	Romani	Vlah
Macedonians	853971	1986	281	934	277	2565
Albanians	2152	153502	6569	181	70	1
Turks	32392	27087	143615	534	70	10
Roms	1040	860	2066	25	16456	1
Vlahs	137	4	2	14	0	8130
Serbs	3945	0	8	31070	41	9
Muslim	*	*	*	*	*	*
Yugoslav	2152	25	50	563	2	4
Other	322	341	569	5258	173	31
Total	896651	183805	153160	38579	17089	10751

1981

Declared Nationality	Declared Mother Tongue: Macedonian	Albanian	Turkish	Serbo-Croat	Romani	Vlah
Macedonians	1276878	190	160	547	316	*
Albanians	1218	374181	3	440	1697	*
Turks	16608	8592	60768	366	94	*
Roms	4160	1697	808	24	36399	*
Vlahs	1111	1	0	3	2	5257
Serbs	8521	10	3	35867	14	*
Muslim	15075	4968	2038	16325	308	30
Yugoslav	7645	1943	274	2746	530	*
Other	13282	4247	2853	17031	1280	*
Total	1334498	391829	64907	63349	37780	5931

[4]The 1974 constitution recognized three types of ethnically defined collectives: *narod* 'nation', *narodnost* 'nationality', and *etnička grupa* 'ethnic group'. The difference between a *narod* and a *narodnost* was that a *narod* was considered a constitutive nation of Yugoslavia and of its constituent republics (Slovene, Serb, Croat, Macedonian, Montenegrin, and Muslim) whereas a *narodnost* was *de facto* a minority that was a constituent of a national-state other than Yugoslavia, e.g. Turks. An ethnic group was a minority with no nation state beyond the borders of Yugoslavia, i.e. the Vlahs and the Roms. An exception to this principle were the Ruthenians (Rusyni), who live primarily in Vojvodina and who did not have an external nation-state but were nonetheless given the status of *narodnost*. A major complaint of the Albanians during this period was that while they constituted a numerically larger group than Macedonians or Montenegrins, they were considered a *narodnost* while the latter each constituted a *narod*. Each category implied a different level of linguistic and other collective rights mitigated by factors of size and distribution: the language of a *narod* (Slovenian, Macedonian, Serbo-Croatian) was official at the federal level. However, federal laws and regulations were also to be published in Albanian and Hungarian, making them semi-federal. The language of a *narodnost* was official at the republic or provincial level (e.g. Turkish in Macedonia, Hungarian in Vojvodina), the communal (municipality) level (e.g. Italian in Slovenia, Bulgarian in Serbia), or not at all (e.g., German, Polish, and Russian) (see Bugarski 1992, Škiljan 1992). The languages of ethnic groups did not receive guaranteed official support, but their constitutional recognition positioned them to seek such support. Although the Roms had the status of *narodnost* in the Republic constitution of Bosnia-Hercegovina, this had no practical effect (Škiljan 1992:40).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE THREE - PART II (continued from previous page)

1994 Declared Mother Tongue / Declared Nationality	Macedonian	Albanian	Turkish	Serbo-Croat†	Romani	Vlah	Bulgarian
Macedonians	1289868	124	124	1938	94	259	125
Albanians	2063	426418	210	135	•	•	0
Turks	10885	906	62726	86**	11	0	•
Roms	5974	1212	1311	14**	34955	•	•
Vlahs	1800	•	0	12	0	6747	0
Serbs	11693	0	8	27843	•	•	32
Muslim	5552	605	180	1181	20	•	•
Bosniac††	36	21	•	312**	0	0	•
Bulgarian	358	0	•	80	0	•	1216
Egyptian	961	1856	42	10	•	0	0
Other	3793	221	64	3484	40	30	75
Total	1332983	431363	64665	35095	35120	7036	1448

*Not specified
• Under 10

Difference between declared nationality and declared mother tongue for the six main languages of the Republic of Macedonia: 1953, 1981, 1994

Sources: Savezni zavod za statistiku 1953a, Savezni zavod za statistiku 1988, Antonovska et al. 1996

As can be seen from the table, there is a fairly high correlation between declared Romani nationality and declared Romani mother tongue. In fact, the correlation of over 96% is well above the Yugoslav average of 79.1% of those with Romani nationality declaring Romani mother tongue (Petrović1992:120). This can be taken as an indicator of the strength of the correlation between declared Romani language and nationality in Macedonia. What these figures do not -- and cannot -- reveal, however, is the fact that many Roms declare another nationality (and/or mother tongue) due to the social stigma attached to Romani.[5] Since the majority of Roms in Macedonia are Muslim, and moreover urban, Turkish represents a significant prestige language while Albanian represents numerical strength as the language of the largest predominantly Muslim minority. We can also note here that the drop in Roms declaring Turkish mother tongue between 1953 and 1981 correlates with the migration of Turks to Turkey (largely for economic reasons) in the late 1950s (cf. Katona 1969, Jašar-Nasteva 1992). Many other Muslims also declared themselves as Turks on the basis of religion in order to emigrate to a non-communist country. The tremendous discrepancy between declared Turkish and Albanian nationalities in 1948 and 1953 was politically motivated. The 1948 census was conducted before the Tito-Stalin break, when relations with communist Albania were good and relations with non-communist Turkey were bad. By 1953, Yugoslavia had been expelled from Cominform and was not on good terms with Albania whereas by contrast relations with Turkey had thawed considerably (cf. Tanasković 1992). Although not readily ascertainable from census figures, these changes in relations also affected Roms, albeit not those declaring Romani mother tongue. At present, the issue of education for non-Romani speaking Gypsies also involves ethnic politics.[6] There is pressure on Muslim Gypsies to go to Albanian or Turkish rather than Macedonian schools, the better to justify expanding minority language education (cf. e.g. *Flaka e Vëllazërimit* 86.01.06:10 on the situation in Kumanovo, also *Birlik* 84.10.01:14). Current concern in

† This figure represents *Serbian* and *Croatian* which were listed as separate languages in the 1994 census.

†† 6426 Bosniacs were listed in the column 'Other' for mother tongue. Presumably the overwhelming majority declared Bosnian. 7795 Muslims were also in the 'Other' column and presumably also listed Bosnian.

[5] Albanian and Turkish are probably more frequent than Macedonian due to the fact that most Roms in Macedonia are Muslim and the former two languages are more closely identified with Islam (cf. note 1). According to Faik Abdi, cited in Čangova (1991), most Roms who declare another nationality and/or mother tongue in western Macedonia declare themselves as Albanians while in eastern Macedonia they declare themselves as Turks. This would reflect the relative numerical strength of these two groups in these two regions.

[6] I am using the term *Gypsy* here as a cover term for all those European groups descended from Indic-speakers who arrived in Europe during the Middle Ages.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Macedonia with Romani education is not merely connected to Article 48 of the Republic's constitution, which guarantees minority language rights, but can also be seen as aimed at reducing challenges from Albanian and Turkish.

There are also the *Ġupci*, or *Egipḱani*, endogamous, non-Romani speaking groups of Romani descent who do not identify as Roms and who in Macedonia speak Albanian (e.g., in Ohrid and Struga) or Macedonian (e.g. in Bitola) as their first language (Friedman 1985b, Ljubisavljević 1990, Risteski 1991, Duijzings 1992, Forthcoming, Xadži-Ristiḱ 1994, Zemon 1996).[7] Although they sought to be recognized as a separate category in the 1981 census, they were placed in the category "unknown" (*Nova Makedonija* 82.03.06:9, whereas in the 1991 and 1994 censuses they were recognized as a distinct group (but see Abduramanoski 1994). Both Romani and Albanian ethnopoliticians claim them for their own, but the Ġupci identify with neither.

While Romani-speaking groups are often associated in the popular mind with nomadism, and indeed many groups were and some still are peripatetic -- in France, for example, more than half the Gypsy and Traveler population is nomadic or semi-sedentary (Chalumeau and Gualdaroni 1995) -- Romani people have been settled in the Balkans in general and Macedonia in particular for centuries (see Friedman and Dankoff 1991). The social situation of many if not most Roms in Macedonia is thus quite different from that of many groups living elsewhere. The education issues facing many European countries, and the United States as well, involve significant differences between Romani and non-Romani culture -- issues such as how to deliver societal services to nomadic groups, adapting the educational curriculum to the needs of children from a very different culture, etc. The Romani-speaking people of Macedonia, however, are part of a region where multilingualism and multiculturalism are a centuries-old tradition. The very existence of the Balkan linguistic league is testimony to this. The Balkan linguistic league (or Sprachbund) consists of the Balkan Slavic languages (Bulgarian, Macedonian, and the Torlak dialects of Serbian), the Balkan Romance languages (Romanian, Megleno-Romanian, and Aromanian [Vlah]), Greek and Albanian, all of which share a variety of significant structural similarities as the result of centuries of language contact. As the Slovene linguist Jernej Kopitar wrote in 1829, these languages gave the impression of having a single grammar (Sprachform) with different lexicons (Sprachmateriel). Moreover, although they are not usually included in studies of the Balkan linguistic league, the Balkan Romani dialects do in fact share a number of significant grammatical features with the other Balkan languages (see Kostov 1973, Friedman 1985a, Matras 1994). A brief illustrative example is given in Table Four.

TABLE FOUR

Romani	te džas	mangav	te	hramonav
Albanian	të shkojmë	dua	të	shkruaj
Greek	ná páme	thelō	ná	gráfō
Bulgarian	da trŭgnem	iskam	da	piša
Macedonian	da odime	sakam	da	pišuvam
Torlak Serbian	da idemo	oću	da	pišem
Romanian	să mergem	vreau	să	scriu
Vlah (Kruševo)	s- neádzimŭ	voi	si	scriu
English	*'let us/if we go'*	*'I want to write'*		

Optative-Subjunctive particle replaces infinitive and other structures in the Balkan Languages

However, while Romani-speakers constitute an integral albeit distinct and sometimes marginalized segment of Macedonian society, and while issues in Romani education parallel issues in other minority language education in Macedonia, there is a significant difference: while the Albanian, Turkish, and Serbian minorities in Macedonia have codified languages to serve as the bases of education, Romani, like Vlah (Aromanian), lacks such a standard. In the case of Vlah, there is a codified literary language, viz. Romanian, which is sufficiently close that it can provide a model if not a substitute. In fact, there is a movement that would

[7]Like the English term Gypsy, these ethnonyms derive from ethnonymic terms meaning 'Egyptian'.

replace Vlah with Romanian, but this is resisted by the majority of Vlahs in Macedonia (cf. Jašar-Nasteva Forthcoming) in the same way that, e.g., the Macedonians resisted the imposition of Bulgarian, the Ukrainians resisted Russian, the Slovaks resisted Czech, or the Norwegians resisted Danish (cf. Haugen 1968). Romani, however, is faced with a different problem which makes it unique in Macedonia and unusual in Europe: not only does there not exist at this time an established Romani linguistic norm, but Romani's closest relatives -- the languages of western India such as Hindi and Punjabi -- are too distant from Romani to have even the slightest chance of substituting for it, although their relationship to Romani in terms of vocabulary enrichment is a separate issue, one which we shall discuss below (cf. also Friedman 1989). Thus Romani education cannot take place effectively without settling the Romani "*questione della lingua*" (*čhibakoro phučipe*).

As was mentioned earlier, the 1970s saw both a change in Romani legal status and attempts at advancing Romani-language education. In general, however, these attempts met with a variety of difficulties. In 1971, Šaip Jusuf, a Rom who had earned a B.A. in physical education from the University of Belgrade, began work on a Romani grammar with Krume Kepeski, a professor at the Skopje Pedagogical Academy (*Nova Makedonija* 80.02.15:10; cf. also Koneski 1950, Lunt 1952:v). By 1973 Jusuf and Kepeski had completed the manuscript of their grammar (Prof. Kepeski was kind enough to show me the manuscript while I was in Macedonia), and they were seeking publication. Due to various complicating factors, however, the grammar did not appear until 1980. The appearance of Jusuf and Kepeski (1980) in a tirage of 3,000 copies signaled a new phase in the development of the standardization of Romani in Macedonia. The book is written in both Romani and Macedonian on facing pages and was the most ambitious attempt of its kind at the time. The express purpose of the book was the creation of a Literary Romani for use by Roms in Macedonia, Kosovia,[8] and adjacent parts of Serbia, with a view to the creation of Romani-language schools in these areas and to the use of this literary standard as a basis for the creation of a Romani literary language for use by Roms in general(Jusuf and Kepeski 1980:4-5).[9] The language of the grammar is based on the Arli dialect of Skopje, although Jusuf makes frequent use of his native Džambaz dialect -- especially when citing Romani forms in the Macedonian text -- and occasionally Gurbet and Burgudži forms are also mentioned.[10] I have published a detailed analysis of this grammar elsewhere (Friedman 1985c). For the purposes of this paper it will suffice to point out the some of the most salient types of

[8]Because both the [original] Slavic Kosovo and the Albanian [and Turkish] Kosova currently have political implications whose complexities I wish to eschew, I have chosen to use the productive English suffix when writing about this place in English.

[9]The question of whether Romani is to be considered a single language with numerous dialects or as a group of closely related languages is not of immediate concern to this article. The most commonly held opinion among linguists is that Romani is to be treated as a single language (cf., Kochanowski 1963:184-92; Hancock 1975:26; Ventcel' and Čerenkov 1976:283, Cortiade 1984) despite varying degrees of mutual intelligibility. Questions of the definition of language and dialect involve more factors than mere intelligibility, as can be seen from such classic examples as the mutually unintelligible *dialects* of Chinese or the mutually intelligible *languages* of Scandinavia, but the discussion of the relationship among language, dialect, ethnic identity, and national identity are beyond the scope of this article. For our purposes, we shall adopt the commonly held view of linguists just alluded to (cf. also Haugen 1966, Lunt 1984).

[10]We are accepting here as a useful heuristic device the distinction between the so-called Vlax and Non-Vlax dialects of Romani. Although the Romani dialectal situation in the Republic of Macedonia is quite complex, the majority of speakers use dialects of a Non-Vlax type that are described by the self-ascriptive cover term Arli(< Turkish *yerli* 'local'). Next in importance for Macedonia is Džambaz (< Turkish *cambaz* 'acrobat, horse-dealer', known elsewhere as Gurbet, related to Kalderaš, Lovari, Čurari, Mačvano, etc.), which is a Vlax type dialect that has undergone Non-Vlax influence. Also of significance for Macedonia is Burgudži or Bugurdži (< Turkish *burgucu* 'gimlet-maker', also known as Rabadži [< Turkish *arabacı* 'drayman'] or Kovačja [< Slavic *Kovač* 'blacksmith'], a name which is also used for other groups including the non-Romani speaking Gupci of southwestern Macedonia), which is also a Non-Vlax dialect. The details of Romani dialectal differentiation are beyond the scope of this paper. For a summary of current theories see Hancock (1995). Vencel' and Čerenkov (1976) and Boretzky and Igla (1994:361-415) give useful comparative sketches of Romani dialects. Cf. also Table Seven for some illustrative examples.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

problems raised by Jusuf and Kepeski (1980) with respect to the standardization of Romani and its use in education:

1. Orthographic conventions were not standardized as illustrated by the following examples: syllable final jot is indicated by both /i/ and /j/ as in the spellings *muj* and *mui* 'mouth', the automatic fronting of velars before front vowels is inconsistently indicated, e.g. *kerdo* and *kjerdo* 'done', the opposition between a uvular fricative /x/ and a glottal glide /h/ -- phonemic in some Romani dialects but not in others -- is not made consistently, e.g. *xor* 'depth' but *hordaripe* 'deepening', *xramonel* 'write' but *hramondikano* 'written', etc.
2. Competing dialectal forms are not selected but rather mixed, as seen in the following examples. The basic form of the instrumental singular marker is {-sa} but the /s/ is lost intervocalically in Arli. On the Romani side of one of the nominal paradigms, the instrumental singular of the word for 'wind' is given as *bavlal-aa, -asa* while on the Cyrillic side it is given as бавлалаја (*bavlalaja*). In fact, *bavlal* is the Arli dialectal form, the Džambaz and etymologically older form being *balval.* Similarly, the second singular present tense morpheme, which also has the basic shape {-sa}and has both the Arli-specific loss of /s/ and a morphological variant without the final /a/ in all the dialects, is used in various places in all its possible realizations: *keresa/kereja/kerea* ↔ *keres/kere* 'you do'. Similarly, for the nominative plural definite article both Arli/Burgudži *o* and Džambaz/Gurbet *e* are used, e.g. *o Roma* and *e Roma* 'the Roms', feminine nouns in consonants are used with both jotated and non-jotated oblique stems, e.g. *čhiba-* and *čhibja-*, etc.
3. Neologisms are coined from Hindi, sometimes with disregard for the Romani phonological system, rather than based on native material or borrowed from languages familiar to the speakers e.g. *bhaga* 'consciousness'.
4. The grammar was written on a level for use in a high school or pedagogical academy, but at the time there were no textbooks at the elementary school level. The grammar could thus at most have been used to prepare teachers, but the cadre of educated and motivated individuals and particularly the organizational structure was lacking.

Although the cultural organization Phralipe 'Brotherhood' was formed in 1948, it was not until the 1970s and 1980s, that sporadic attempts were made at advancing Romani education and related linguistic rights such as use in the mass media. Thus there were radio programs broadcast out of cities and towns such as Belgrade and Niš in Serbia and Tetovo in Macedonia (cf. Puxon 1979:89), a monthly entitled *Krlo e romengo* 'Voice of the Roms' was published for nine months in 1973 in Belgrade (Dalbello 1989). Books in Romani, most of them poetry, were published in all of the capitals of the ex-Yugoslav republics and autonomous regions as well as in smaller towns such as Leskovac and Preševo. Classes in Romani were begun in Gilan (Gnjilane) and Ferizaj (Ferizovik, Uroševac) in Kosovia (Birlik 9.X.94:14) and informal classes outside the regular school structure were also organized in the predominantly Romani Skopje suburb Šuto Orizari (Šutka), which was where a large number of Roms from Skopje and later elsewhere settled after the disastrous Skopje earthquake of 1963.[11] In 1977, Šaip Jusuf translated a book about Tito into Romani with significant press coverage (*Nova Makedonija* 77.09.28-30:9, Jusuf 1978). It was the first non-periodical publication in Macedonia (and Yugoslavia) by a Rom for Roms. Shortly thereafter, a number of anthologies of Romani poetry and stories were published, mostly in bilingual editions (e.g. Djurić 1979, Dimić 1979, Krasnići 1981, Salijesor 1984, Balić et al. 1984, Dimić 1986, see also Dalbello 1989) as well as a Romani-Serbo-Croatian-English

[11] According to the 1994 census (Antonovska et al. 1994b, 1994c), 47.9% of Macedonia's Romani population lives in the five Skopje municipalities, more than half of them in the municipality of Čair, where Šutka is located. The next largest concentrations are Prilep (8.5%), Kumanovo (7.1%), Tetovo (5.5%), Gostivar (4.8%), Bitola (3.8%), Štip (3.3%), Debar (2.5%), and Valandovo (2%). In terms of proportions, Roms constitute 3.9% of the population in the five municipalities of Skopje, but 14.9% in Čair. Other relatively sizable proportions are Vinica (4.6%), Debar (4.2%), Prilep (4%), Berovo (3.5%), Štip (2.9%), Kičevo (2.6%), Delčevo (2.5%), Kumanovo (2.4%), Kočani (2.3%), and Kriva Palanka (2.3%).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

dictionary (Uhlik 1983). More than ten years after Jusuf (1978), however, Trajko Petrovski's (1989) translation of the pre-World War Two Macedonian poet Kočo Racin's collection *Beli Mugri* ('White mists') into Romani was still an unusual event,.

Throughout this period, pedagogical materials were virtually nonexistent. The classes mentioned above were conducted without formal textbooks. Jusuf and Kepeski (1980), while it brought attention to the Romani language, did not function in an institutional context. Although translations, original belle lettres, folklore collections, and scholarly studies[12] appeared with increasing frequency, they did not change the educational situation. Cortiade (1984), published in an expanded version in Titograd (Podgorica) in 1986, was an attempt to formulate a transdialectal orthography that would serve as the basis of both literary communication and a literary language for use in schools. Although this orthography has been gaining increasing acceptance in Western Europe (see also Cortiade et al. 1991, Cortiade 1994), and was even the basis of a primer published in Sarajevo (Kurtiàde 1990) in a tirage of 2,000 with a teachers manual in a tirage of 1,000, this orthography has not had a significant impact on publications in Macedonia. Problems with this orthography will be discussed below (see also Friedman 1995a).

In 1990, Yugoslavia along with the rest of Eastern Europe entered an era of political pluralism. The tragic results of the nationalist hijacking of that political process, a course of action that had already begun during the previous decade, are too well known to require further comment here.[13] The Romani contribution to the ethnopolitical movement, however, is not perceived as a challenge to the legitimacy of the Macedonian state and has been careful to insist on its loyalty to the Republic of Macedonia.[14] The Party for the Complete Emancipation of the Roms (Macedonian: *Partija za Celosna Emancipacija na Romite*, Romani: *Partija Saste Emancipacijake e Romengiri* PCER or PSER) was founded on 12 August 1990 with Faik Abdi (Faik Abdieskoro), a wealthy businessman from Shutka, as its leader.[15] The first item in the party program concerned education. Among the planks in the educational platform were the following (Predlog 1990):

1. Opening of pre-school/day-care centers in which children could be exposed to both Macedonian and Romani simultaneously
2. Elementary education in Macedonian with 2-3 hours a week Romani instruction
3. Founding of a Department of Romology at Skopje University, one which would contribute to the overall improvement of the condition of the Romani nationality
4. Post-graduate studies and exchanges with India
5. Romani children learn the history of their people, especially about Hitler's holocaust against the Roms during World War Two, which is to made part of the facultative language classes 3-4 hours a week.

The third section of the party program was concerned with the Romani language, and called not only for minority language rights equal with other minority languages but also expressed concern for the normativization of Romani and close cooperation with institutions in India.

---

[12] An especially prolific scholar has been Rade Uhlik, who published a Serbo-Croatian-Romani dictionary as early as 1947 and had published Romani poetry even prior to that (Uhlik 1937; see also Dalbello 1989).

[13] Of the plethora of books that have sprung from this tragedy, Woodward (1995) is the first major scholarly work in English (see Hayden 1995) and gives a particularly clear analysis of the role of international involvement. Silber and Allen (1995) represents the best journalistic account in English in the opinion of many educated observers (Vesna Pusić, University of Zagreb, personal communication).

[14] This is in contrast to, e.g., some Albanian ethnopoliticians in Macedonia, who on occasion dispute the legitimacy of Macedonian statehood and even national identity (e.g. Xhaferi 1995).

[15] Like other ethnopolitical parties in Macedonia, the leadership of PCER denies that the party is "mononational" and points to the existence of party members belonging to other nationalities to demonstrate this (Čangova 1991). As with other ethnopolitical parties, however, the fact remains that the party's political concerns are focused on a specific ethnic group. In 1991 the party changed its name to Party for the Complete emancipation of the Roms of Macedonia Romani: *Partija Saste Emancipacijake e Romengiri tari Makedonija*, Macedonian *Partija za Celosna Emancipacija na Romite na Makedonija* .

On 8 September 1991 a referendum was held concerning independence for the Republic of Macedonia. Material encouraging people to vote was printed in all six major languages of Macedonia including Romani.[16] It was perhaps the first time Romani appeared on the front page of the principal Macedonian daily newspaper, Nova Makedonija (91.09.08:1).[17]

In Fall 1991, Faik Abdi sent a letter in the name of PCER to the rector of the University of Skopje demanding the opening of a Romani Studies Department but the establishment of such a Department remains a desideratum that has yet to be achieved. In early 1992, a group of Romani intellectuals formed a second Romani political party, the Democratic Progressive Party of the Roms in Macedonia, headed by Bekir Arif. A major issue for the new party was increasing the pace of educational reforms (*Nova Makedonija* 21.X.1992:4). There was also disagreement between the two parties over questions of language standardization, dialectal compromise and the place of Romani in educational institutions. Among the debated issues were whether Romani should be a language of instruction (Macedonian: *nastaven jazik*) or a language of study (Macedonian: *nastaven predmet*) and whether or not the standard was to be based entirely on the Arli, dialect, spoken by the majority or Roms in Macedonia, or whether elements of other dialects should be included. Table Five gives a selection of diagnostic words illustrating some of the most salient phonological, morphological, and lexical differences among the main dialects spoken in Macedonia. Among the features illustrated are the following: palatal mutation of dentals before stressed /i/ ('work'), treatment of inherited intervocalic retroflex *nd ('bread'), palatalization an loss of /n/ intervocalically before stressed /i/ ('water'), formation of the aorist ('I gave'), the shibboleth 'thus', intervocalic /s/ in grammatical suffixes ('with God'), shape and gender in the 3 pl pronoun ('they'), and shape of the definite article (nominative plural = masculine nominative singular vs nominative plural = oblique singular and plural and distinct feminine nominative singular vs feminine nominative singular = nominative and oblique plural).

TABLE FIVE

Burgudži	buci	maro	pani	diyom	kidjal	devlesa	on, ol	o-i-o-e
Arli	buti	maro	pani	dindjum	agjar	devlea	on, ola	o-i-o-e
Džambaz	buki	manro	pai	diyem	gəja	devlesa	von	o-i-e-e
Gurbet	bući	marno	pai	diyem	gaja	devleha	von	o-e-e-e
English	*work*	*bread*	*water*	*I gave*	*thus*	*with God*	*they*	*the: Ms-Fs-Np-Obl*

Examples of Romani dialectal differences

It was shortly after this split in the Romani political scene occurred that, on November 20-21, 1992 the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Macedonia and the Philological Faculty of the University of Skopje sponsored a conference for the purpose of reaching an agreement concerning the introduction of Romani as a course of study in Macedonian schools.[18] The conference was attended by a number of Macedonian Roms active in Romani intellectual life, including Šaip Jusuf, Trajko Petrovski, Ġuneš Mustafa, Šaip Isen, Ramo Rušidovski, Tahir Nuhi, Iliaz Zendel, and others. Also present were Donald Kenrick and myself as well as members of the Philological Faculty of Skopje University and the Macedonian Academy of Sciences, most notably Olivera Jašar-Nasteva and Liljana Minova-Ġurkova as well as Živko Cvetkovski, head of the Macedonian Department. Representatives of the political factions were also present at the opening session, but the chair of the meeting deftly prevented the meeting from becoming a series of political speeches and expeditiously turned the conference into a language standardization working group.

[16]The other five are Macedonian, Albanian, Turkish, Aromanian, and Serbian.

[17]The phrase was *Referendumeske '91.'Va: sijam suvereno thaj korkorifundirimi Makedonijake'* '[pertaining to] Referendum '91. Yes: I am for a sovereign and independent Macedonia' (Arli dialect). The advertisement was hexaglossic, but there were also monoglot Romani-language posters encouraging Roms to vote in the referendum.

[18]Concerned Macedonian intellectuals were already attempting to respond to the need for Romani-language education by the summer of 1991, when Dimitar Mirčev, who was then a professor of Sociology at the University of Skopje discussed with me the possibility of holding a normativization conference in Skopje.

It quickly emerged that the Roms present at this conference were not in favor of the establishment of Romani as a language of instruction in a parallel education system but rather the teaching of Romani as a subject in elementary schools and pedagogical academies with a view to preparing a cadre of teachers and ultimately a lectureship and Department of Romani at the University of Skopje. As mentioned above, one of the explicit goals of Romani politics in Macedonia is the establishment of such a Department, but a qualified cadre of faculty has yet to be trained.

The document that resulted from these deliberations, which was reproduced in full and analyzed in detail in Friedman (1995), was agreed upon by representatives of the various political currents as well as by the intellectuals that produced it. The document addresses a number of issues in Romani language standardization, e.g. the Arli dialect is specified as the base, with elements from other dialects being incorporated into it, and basic orthographic, morphophonological and morphological rules are specified in a series of twelve points. The document should be viewed in the context of Jusuf and Kepeski (1980), Kenrick (1981), and Cortiade et al. (1991). As indicated above, both Jusuf and Kenrick were present at the conference. Moreover, both Jusuf and Kenrick participated in the deliberations of the Language Commission at the Fourth World Romani Congress, at which Cortiade et al. (1991) was discussed and signed. Jusuf was a signatory to that document, but Kenrick was not. Mention should also be made here of Hancock (1975, 1993), which, while important for the history of Romani standardization, did not have a direct bearing on the 1992 conference. The former had been superseded by subsequent publications and events while the latter had not yet appeared.

Orthography has always been an issue for the standardization of Romani. Because efforts at Romani education have taken place in the context of the languages of other countries, as many orthographies have been used for Romani as there are standard languages with which is has been in contact. Although Romani in Cyrillic-using countries such as Russia and Bulgaria has been written in Cyrillic, a consensus has emerged to use a Latin based orthography as the most universally accessible (cf. Kyuchukov et al. 1995) -- considerations which also influenced the choice of alphabet for Albanian (see Skendi 1967:366-90). In the case of Macedonia, which in the context of former Yugoslavia had an established bi-alphabetical tradition, Romani has always been written using a Latin orthography similar to that of Kenrick (1981), although Jusuf and Kepeski (1980) also use a Macedonian-based Cyrillic orthography for Romani in their Macedonian parallel text. At the 1992 Skopje conference Macedonian Roms preferred to continue developing an orthography like that of the Second World Romani Congress (Kenrick 1981) rather than the Fourth.

Table six illustrates some of the salient differences between the Fourth World Romani Congress orthography and that of the 1992 Macedonian Conference.

TABLE SIX

	Cortiade et al. (1991)	1992 Macedonian Conference	dialectal pronunciations	
Rom (loc. sg.)	Romesθe	Romeste	[romeste]	[romesće]
Rom (loc. pl.)	Romenθe	Romende	[romende]	[romende]
Rom (abl. sg.)	Romesθar	Romestar	[romestar]	
Rom (abl. pl.)	Romesθar	Romendar	[romendar]	
Rom (dat. sg.)	Romesqe	Romeske	[romesće]	[romeske]
Rom (dat. pl.)	Romenqe	Romenge	[romende]	[romenge]
done (pl. pt.)	kerde	kerde	[ćerde]	[kerde]
Rom [instr. sg.]	Romeça	Romesa	[Romea]	[Romesa]
you do (sg.)	keresa	keresa	[ćerea]	[keresa]

Comparison of current Romani orthographies

The treatment of underlying or historical dental and/or velar stops is an area of both considerable and salient dialectal variation and morphophonemic alternation in Romani. These phonemes can be pronounced as palatals and/or with affricated or fricativized

articulation in various dialects of Macedonia and elsewhere (see Ventcel' and Čerenkov 1976 and Boretzky and Igla 1994 for details). Moreover, as seen in Table Six (as mentioned earlier), some Romani dialects eliminate intervocalic /s/ in certain grammatical morphemes. Cortiade et al. (1991) articulates the principle of using underlying forms in most environments, but has special graphic symbols for the abovementioned morphophonemic alternations in their function as case markers (which Cortiade et al. [1991] treats as postpositions, but see Friedman 1991), viz. θ, q, and ç for dentals, velars, and /s/, respectively. Thus in the orthography of Cortiade et al. (1991) the same morphophonemic alternations have different spellings, while the same graphic symbols have different pronunciations whose dialectal variations are represented by different letters in roots and verbal affixes on the one hand and in case affixes on the other, as illustrated in the Table Six.

On 17 November 1993 the first issue of a Romani monthly newspaper, *Romani Sumnal/Romski Svet* 'Romani World', was published in Skopje under the editorial leadership of Oskar Mamut, who is also employed in the Romani-language division of Radio-Television Skopje.[19] The newspaper is bilingual, with all material in both Romani and Macedonian. The issue of the codification of a Romani standard language is explicitly addressed on the first page of the first number, where the editorial board states that one of the tasks they have set themselves is contributing to the development and use of literary Romani. As such, the paper can be taken as a measure of the progress and ongoing concerns of the standardization of Romani in the Republic of Macedonia. The role of the mass media is potentially of great importance in language standardization.

In its basic principles, *Romano Sumnal* represents a development in the direction described by the decisions reached at the 1992 Skopje conference and indicated in Jusuf and Kepeski (1980), namely an Arli base with elements from other dialects using a Latin orthography of the type in wide use in Eastern Europe, including Jusuf and Kepeski (1980), and recommended at the 1971 standardization conference (cf. Also Hancock 1993, 1995). Nonetheless, specifics of the solutions reached by *Romano Sumnal* differ from those seen elsewhere (see Friedman Forthcoming). Taken as a whole, *Romano Sumnal* clearly represents a step forward in the standardization of Romani in the Republic of Macedonia. The editors are aware of standardization issues and are attempting to make concrete contributions towards a consistent and usable norm.

Of particular importance to *Romano Sumnal* was the issue of education. Four articles were dedicated to the topic in the first issue (Bajramovska 1993, Mamut 1993, Darman 1993, Jašarov 1993). Darman (1993) speaks directly to the concerns of Romani parents for creating a home environment conducive to the success of children who are just beginning school. The other three articles are all critical of the fact that at the time they were written, Romani was still not a subject in any school curriculum in Macedonia, that the rate of educational success among Romani children is not showing any signs of increase, and that the few Romani intellectuals either hide their origins or bicker with one another rather than cooperating. While the very existence of a newspaper complaining about these conditions is itself something of a step forward, the fact remains that Romani education, like many other social programs, has not progressed with alacrity. Emilija Simoska, Minister of Education, has observed that education is functioning as a proxy for interethnic relations so not enough attention is being paid to curriculum (pc 8.XII.95)

Nonetheless, progress is being made. When in June-July 1994, at the behest of the International Conference on Former Yugoslavia (ICFY) and under the sponsorship of the Council of Europe, an extraordinary census was carried out in the Republic of Macedonia (see Friedman 1996), Romani was one of the six official languages of census forms and documents, including the training manual for enumerators, in accordance with Article 35 of

[19] Although the newspaper was intended as a monthly, it has so far appeared only thrice: 17 November 1993, 10 December 1993, and 1 April 1994.

the census law. The published materials connected with the 1994 census represent the first official use of Romani in the Republic of Macedonia and were thus intimately connected with the standardization of Literary Romani in that country. The language of the census forms displays significant progress in the achievement of standardization and as such represents a significant development of Romani in official usage (Friedman 1995b).

In September 1995 Šaip Jusuf's Romani textbook for elementary schools was finally in press at Prosvetno Delo, the reviews having been completed in July of that year. Although Jusuf originally envisioned a series of textbooks beginning with grade one, the current book is intended for grade 3. The manuscript contained about a hundred texts, in poetry (24) and prose (80). The amount of material is about twice as much as can be covered in a year at two hours a week (i.e. 70 hours), and the question of norm versus dialect is not explicitly addressed. The final version also included a vocabulary and pages of pictures for stories. One problem with the review process was that the two reviewers with pedagogical expertise knew no Romani, while the Romani reviewer had no pedagogical experience. The Romani reviewer criticized the text for excessive Indicism (using *namaste* 'hail' (Hindi) instead of *sar sijan* 'how are you' or *šukar/lačho dive* 'good day', the Indicism *badali* instead of the colloquial Turkism*buluti* 'cloud'), but sometimes picked on dialectal details (suggesting *kanzavuri* for *kanauri* 'hedgehog', *farba* (from German) for *renki* (from Persian, probably via Turkish) 'color' (cf. Friedman 1989). However, he also caught orthographic inconsistencies, e.g. the need to treat the syllable *o-* in the 3 sg acc. pronoun as part of the stem: *ole* and not *o le* (as if *o* were the definite article). The textbook was officially published and announced to the public on 8 April 1996, but as of this writing (March 1997) it had not yet been released due to financial complications.

Meanwhile, developments in neighboring and other Balkan countries are taking place each independent of the other. In Albania (Kurtiàde 1994) the Fourth World Romani Congress orthography and pedagogical materials sponsored by the European commission are circulating, but it is unclear if any of them are in actual use. Similarly, in Romania a pedagogical manual for teacher training complete with lessons using the Fourth World Romani Congress orthography (Cortiade et al. 1991) has been published (Sarău 1992, cf. also Sarău 1992) and European Commission-sponsored projects are being undertaken (*Interface* 15[8/94]:5), but so far Romani is only a language of study at the university level (Lemon: Romnet 95.XII.20). In Bulgaria some materials use an adaptation of Bulgarian Cyrillic for Romani (e.g. Malikov 1992), but an English-type Latin orthography using digraphs rather than diacritics is also in use (Kyuchukov et al. 1995), e.g. sh=š, ch=č, chh/chsh=čh, j=dž, zh=ž, x=ks h, y, ts, ph, th, kh w=schwa, and studies have been conducted for bilingual literacy (Kyuchukov 1995).[20] Romani is also being taught at the University of Sofia (1995-97) by Birgit Igla, a non-Rom specialist in Romani with extensive fieldwork experience in Balkan Romani. In Greece, various studies have been conducted and conferences held, but none of them are concerned with education of Romani children in Romani (*Interface* 18[5/95]:18, 13[\2/94]:15-20, 8[11/92]:12). Rather, in accordance with Greece's assimilationist language policies towards its minorities (cf. Human Rights Watch 1994), the concern is with teaching Greek. Although former Yugoslavia was home to some of the most progressive Romani activities such as the first Romani summer school, which was held in Belgrade (*Interface* 16[11/94]:3), the war has resulted in the persecution of Roms living in the FRY and other Former-Serbo-Croatian speaking lands, and many have fled to Western Europe (see *Interface* 19[8/95]:20-22).

In conclusion we can say that while progress in Romani language education in the Republic of Macedonia has been slow, it has been made. Romani has gradually risen in status from total legal absence to legal equality with all other minority languages, even if the de facto realization has not yet met the de jure possibilities. The standardization of Romani

[20] Cf. also Hübschmannová et al., which uses a Czech based orthography.

and the fixing of the Arli dialectal base with other elements, together with a consistent orthography, has made significant progress from Jusuf and Kepeski (1980), to Romano Sumnal (1993) to the census (1994) to Jusuf's third grade textbook (1996). Similarly, the orthography conference of 1992 probably helped make actors aware of the need for consistency. While activity in the Republic of Macedonia has not been coordinated with that going on in neighboring countries or western Europe, it is endeavoring to meet the needs of the people for whom it is intended, and is certainly in advance of, e.g., Greece or FRY. Although politics is clearly playing a role, nonetheless, the essential issues remain pedagogical and normative. The introduction of Romani as a language of study at the elementary level has the potential to exert an enormous influence on the future codification of Romani both within the Republic of Macedonia and beyond its borders. While Romani education in Macedonia is progressing slowly, it is nonetheless perceptibly progressing, and if other circumstances in the region allow, the future promises to be better than the past.

REFERENCES

Abduramanoski, Islam. 1994. "Veštačka delba na Romite." *Nova Makedonija* 30.X.94: 7.

Antonovska, Svetlana, et al. 1991. *Broj i struktura na naselenieto vo Republika Makedonija po opštini i nacionalna pripadnost: Sostojba 31.03.1991 godina.* Skopje: Republički zavod za statistika.

Antonovska et al. 1994a. *Statistički godišnik na Republika Makedonija 1993.* Skopje: Republički zavod za statistika.

Antonovska et al. 1994b. *Popis '94: Podatoci za segašnosta i idninata. Prvi rezultati. Soopštenie 1.* Skopje: Zavod za statistika.

Antonovska et al. 1994c. *Popis '94: Podatoci za segašnosta i idninata. Prvi rezultati. Soopštenie 2.* Skopje: Zavod za statistika.

Antonovska, Svetlana, et al. 1996. *Popis naselenieto, domaќinstvata, stanovite i zemjodelskite stopanstva vo Republika Makedonija, 1994 godina, kn. 1, Naselenie po nacionalna pripadnost, veroispoved, majčin jazik i državjanstvo.* Skopje: Republički zavod za statistika.

Bajramovska, Vaska. 1993. Romani siklana -- suno ja nane sunol? *Romano Sumnal* 17.XI.93: 5.

Balić, Sait, et al. 1984. *Jaga - Vatre.* Leskovac: Savet smotra kulturnih dostignicá roma SR Srbije.

Barany, Zoltan. 1994. Living on the Edge: East European Roma in Postcommunist Politics. *Slavic Review* 53.321-44.

Barany, Zoltan. 1995. The Roma in Macedonia: Ethnic Politics and the Marginal Condition in a Balkan State. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 18.515-31.

Boretzky, Norbert and Birgit Igla. 1994. *Wörterbuch Romani-Deutsch-Englisch: Mit einer Grammatik der Dialektvarianten.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Bugarski, Ranko. 1992. Language in Yugoslavia: Situation, Policy, Plannning. in *Language Planning in Yugoslavia*, ed. by Ranko Bugarski and Celia Hawkesworth. Columbus, OH: Slavica. 10-26.

Chalumeau, Nathalie and Raphaël Gualdaroni. 1995. France: The General and Scholastic Situation of the Gypsy Community. *Interface 18* (May 1995).9-17.

Cortiade, Marcel. 1984. *Romani fonetika thaj lekhipa.* Filăn Than: Peskekerdo. (expanded and reprinted 1986 Titograd: Pobjeda).

Cortiade (Kurtiàde), Marcel. 1990. *Rromano startoro.* Sarajevo: Svjetlost.

Cortiade, Marcel. et al. 1991. "I alfabèta e standardone Rromane ćhibaqiri, Décizia "I Rromani Alfabèta". *Informaciaqoro Lil e Rromane Uniaqoro* 1-2, 7-8.

Coritade, Marcel. 1994. *Sikavipen sar te siklŏn e ćhavorre e śirpustikaça.* Toulouse: Centre National de Documentation Pedagogique de Midi-Pyrenées.

Čangova, K. 1991. Na Romite treba da im se pomogne: Razgovor so Faik Abdi, pretsedatel na PCERM. *Nova Makedonia* 15.X.95: 4.

Dalbella, Marija. 1989. Prilog bibliografiji o Romima (Ciganima) u SFR Jugoslaviji. in *Jezik i kultura Roma*, ed. by Milan Šipka. Sarajevo: Insitut za proučavanje nacionalnih odnosa. 429-99.

Darman, Lurin. 1993. E avgo sikljovneskere avgune hape. *Romano Sumnal* 17.XI.93: 6.

Dimić, Trifun. 1979. *Kana vavas ando foro - Dolazeći sa vasvara.* Novi Sad: Irig.

Dimić, Trifun. 1986. *Ćidimata e rromane dilendar - Romska narodna poezija.* Novi Sad: Matica Srpska.

Djurić, Rajok. 1979. *Bi kheresko bi limoresko - Bez doma bez groba.* Belgrade: Nolit.

Duijzings, Ger. 1992. De Egyptenaren in Kosovo en Macedonië. *Amsterdams Sociologisch Tijdschrift* 18,2.24-38.

Duijzings, Ger. Forthcoming. The Making of the Egyptians in Kosovo and Macedonia. in: *The Politics of Ethnic Consciousness*, ed. by Hans Vermeulen & Cora Govers. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Friedman, Victor A. 1985a. Balkan Romani Modality and Other Balkan Languages. *Folia Slavica* 7,3.381-389.

Friedman, Victor A. 1985b. The Sociolinguistics of Literary Macedonian. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, Vol. 52.31-57.

Friedman, Victor A. 1985c. in the Codification of a Standard Romani Literary Language. *Papers from the Fourth and Fifth Annual Meetings: Gypsy Lore Society, North American Chapter.* ed. by Joanne Grumet. New York: Gypsy Lore Society. 56-75.

Friedman, Victor A. 1989. Toward Defining the Position of Turkisms in Romani. *Jezik i kultura Roma.* Sarajevo: Institut za proučavanje nacionalnih odnosa. 251-267.

Friedman, Victor A. 1991. "Romani Nominal Inflection: Cases or Postpositions?". *Problemy opisu gramatycznego języków słowiańskych = Studia gramatyczne, vol. 11.* Warsaw: Polish Academy of Sciences. 57-64.

Friedman, Victor A. 1995a. Romani Standardization and Status in the Republic of Macedonia. in *Romani in Contact: The History, Structure, and Sociology of a Language*, ed. by Yaron Matras. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 1995. 203-217.

Friedman, Victor A. 1995b. Romani and the Census in the Republic of Macedonia. Paper delivered ath the Annual Meeting of the Gypsy Lore society, Leiden, May 1995.

Friedman, Victor A. 1996. Observing the Observers: Language, Ethnicity, and Power in the 1994 Macedonian Census and Beyond. *Toward Comprehensive Peace in Southeastern Europe: Conflict Prevention in the South Balkans.* ed. by Barnett Rubin. New York: Council on Foreign Relations/Twentieth Century Fund. 81-105/119-26.

Friedman, Victor A. Forthcoming. Linguistic Form and Content in the Romani Language Press of the Republic of Macedonia. Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Romani Linguistics (Amsterdam 1994).

Friedman, Victor A. and Robert Dankoff. 1991. The Earliest Text in Balkan (Rumelian) Romani: A Passage from Evliya Çelebi's *Seyāḥat-nāme* (with Robert Dankoff). *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society*, Series 5, 1,1.1-20.

Hadži-Ristić, Miodrag. 1994. Prašanjeto za etnogenezata na Egipќanite vo Makedonija. *Nova Makedonija* 13-17.IX.1994, pp. 16, 16, 15, 22, 9.

Hancock, Ian. 1975. *Problems in the creation of a standard dialect of Romanés. (Social Sciences Research Council Working Papers in Sociolinguistics No. 25.)* Arlington, VA: ERIC.

Hancock, Ian.. 1993. The Emergence of a Union Dialect of North American Vlax Romani, and its Implications for an International Standard. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 99.91-104.

Hancock, Ian. 1995. *A Handbook of Vlax Romani.* Columbus: Slavica.

Haugen, Einar. 1966. Semicommunication: The Language Gap in Scandinavia. *Sociological inquiry* 36.280-97.

Haugen, Einar. 1968. The Scandinavian Languages as Cultural Artifacts. *Language Problems of Developing Nations.* Ed. by Joshua Fishman, Charles Ferguson and J. Das Gupta. pp. 267-84. New York: John wiley & Sons.

Hayden, Robert. 1995. Review of Woodward 1995. *Slavic Review* 54.1114-15.

Hübschmannová, Milena, et al. 1991. Romsko-český a česko-romský kapesní slovník. Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.

Human rights Watch/Helsinki. 1994. *The Macedonians of Greece.* New York: Human rights Watch.

Interface. Information newsletter of the Gypsy Research Centre. Clichy: Gypsy Research Centre, Université René Descartes.

Jašar-Nasteva, Olivera. 1992. Soziolinguistische aspekte des makedonischen und der anderen sprachen in der Republik Makedonien. *Welt der Slaven* 37 (NS 16) 1/2.188-210.

Jašar-Nasteva, Olivera. Forthcoming. A Contribution to the Study of the Revival of the Aromanians of Macedonia (based on an autographed manuscript by G. Prličev). *Balkanistica* 9.

Jašarov, Sejdo. 1993. Simfonijakoro orkestri, prima violina agorutne hevja ki bašalni. *Romano Sumnal* 17.XI.93: 7.

Jusuf, Šaip. 1996. *Sikljova romani čhib.* Skopje:Prosvetno Delo.

Jusuf, Šaip and Krume Kepeski. 1980. *Romani gramatika - Romska gramatika.* Skopje: Naša Kniga.

Jusuf, Šaip et al. (trans.) 1978. *Amen sam e Titoske, O Tito si amaro. (Mi smo Titovi, Tito je naš)* by Drago Zdunić et al. Ljubljana: Univerzum.

Katona, L. 1969 "Le dialecte turc de la Macédoine de l'Ouest", *Türk dili araştırmalrı yıllığı belleten,* 57-194.

Kenrick, Donald. 1981. "Romano alfabeto". *Loli Phabaj* 1, 3-4.

Koneski, Blaže. 1950. Za padežite. *Makedonski jazik* 1,8.165-172.

Kopitar, J. 1829. Albanische, walachische und bulgarische Sprache. *Jahrbücher der Literatur* 46.59-106.

Kostov, Kiril. 1973. Zur Bedeutung des Zigeunerischen für die Erforschung grammatischer Interferenzscheinungen. *Balkansko ezikoznanie* 14,2.99-113.

Krasnići, Ali. 1981. *Čergarendje Jaga - Čergarske Vatre.* Prishtina: Edinstvo.

Kurtiàde 1990 = see Cortiade 1990.

Kyuchukov, et al. 1995. *Romani alfabeta - Romska axbuka.* Sofia: Bulvest-2000.

Kyuchukov, Hristo. 1995. *Romany children and their preparation for literacy: A Case Study.* Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.

Latifić, Ibrahim, et al. 1970. *Vitalni, etnička i migraciona obeležja. Popis stanovništva 1961.* Belgrade: Savezni zavod za statistiku.

Ljubisavljević, Milorad. 1990. Nismo ptice selice. *Start* 9.218.34-35.

Lunt, Horace. 1952. *A Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language.* Skopje: Državno knigoizdatelstvo.

Lunt, Horace. 1984. Some Socio-Linguistic Aspects of Macedonian and Bulgarian. in *Language and Literary Theory: In Honor of Ladislav Matejka,* Ed. by B. Stolz, I. Titunik, and L. Doležel. (Papers in Slavic Philology 5). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan. 83-132.

Mamut, Oskar. 1993. Soske o sikle stagnirinena!? *Romano Sumnal* 17.XI.93: 5.

Malikov, Jašar. 1992. Cigansko-bălgarski rečnik. Sofia: Fondacija "Otvoreno obštestvo".

Matras, Yaron. 1994. Structural Balkanisms in Romani. in *Sprachlicher Standard und Substandard in Südosteuropa und Osteuropa,* ed. by Norbert Reiter. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 195-210.

Pekevski, Boro et al. 1973. *Naselenie po narodnost vo SR Makedonija. Popis na naselenieto i stanovite, 1971 god.* Skopje: Republički zavod za statistika.

Petrović, Ruža. 1992. Demografske osobenosti Roma u Jugoslavii. in *Razvitak Roma u Jugoslavii*, ed. by Filip Mačura. Beograd: SANU. 115-127.

Petrovski, Trajko (trans.) 1989. *Parne detharina (Beli mugri)* by Kočo Racin. Skope: Naša kniga.

Predlog. 1990. Programa na Partijata za celosna emancipacija na Romite od SR Makedonija. typescript. 9pp.

Puxon, Grattan. 1979. Romanès and Language Policy n Jugoslavia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 19.83-90.

Risteski, Stojan. 1991. *Narodni prikazni, pradanija i običai kaj egipḱanite/eǵupcite vo Makedonija.* Ohrid: Nezavisni izdanija.

Salijesor, Selajdini. 1984. *Bahtale dive atar mire sune.* Preševo: Univerziteti e bućengor.

Sarău, Gheorghe. 1991. *Limba romaní.* Bucharest: Editura didactică şi pedagogică.

Sarău, Gheorghe 1992. Mic dicţionar rom-român. Bucharest: Kriterion.

Silverman, Carol. 1995a. Persecution and Politicization: *Roma* (Gypsies) of Eastern Europe. Cultural Survival Quarterly 19,2.43-49.

Savezni Zavod za statistiku. 1954. *Stanovništvo po narodnosti (Knj. 9): Konačni rezultati popisa stanovništva od 15 marta 1948 godine.* Belgrade: Savezni zavod za statistiku.

Savezni Zavod za statistiku. 1981. *Statistički bilten broj 1295 (1981). Popis stanovništva, domačinstva i stanova u 1981 godini: Nacionalni sastav stanovništva po opštinama.* Belgrade: Savezni zavod za statistiku.

Savezni Zavod za statistiku. 1988. *Statistički Godišnjak Jugoslavije* (Knj. 35). Belgrade.

Silber, Laura and Allan Little. 1995. *The Death of Yugoslavia.* London: Penguin.

Silverman, Carol. 1995b. Roma of Shuto Orizari, Macedonia: Class, Politics, and Community. In *East-Central European Communities: the Struggle for Balance in Turbulent Times*, ed. David Kideckel, pp. 197-216. Boulder: Westview Press.

Skendi, Stavro 1967. *The Albanian National Awakening.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Stanković, Vladimir. 1992. Romi u svetlu podataka jugoslovenske statistike. in *Razvitak Roma u Jugoslavii*, ed. by Filip Mačura. Beograd: SANU. 159-79.

Škiljan, Dubravko. 1992. Standard Languages in Yugoslavia. in *Language Planning in Yugoslavia*, ed. by Ranko Bugarski and Celia Hawkesworth. Columbus, OH: Slavica. 27-42.

Tanasković, Darko. 1992. "The Planning of Turkish as a Minority Language in Yugoslavia", in *Language Planning in Yugoslavia*, ed. by Ranko Bugarski and Celia Hawkesworth. Columbus, OH: Slavica. 140-61.

Uhlik, Rade. 1937. *Romane gjilja - Ciganske pesme.* Prijedor: Vučen Štrbac.

Uhlik, Rade. 1947. *Srpskohrvatsko-ciganski rečnik (romane alava).* Sarajevo: Svjetlost.

Uhlik, Rade. 1983. *Srpskohrvatsko-Romsk-Engleski rječnik (Romengo alavari).* Sarajevo: Svjetlost.

Ventcel', T. V. and L. N. Čerenkov (1976) "Dialekty ciganskogo jazyka". in *Jazyki Azii i Afriki I*, ed. by N. I. Konrad. Moscow: Nauka. 283-332.

Woodward, Susan L. 1995. *Balkan Tragedy.* Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Xhaferi, Arbër. 1995. Regjistrimi i jashtëzakonshëm i popullsisë - '94. *Tribuna-Sh* 2,23/24.12-13.

Zemon, Rubin (ed.) 1996. *Zbornik na trudovi za etnogenezata na Egipḱanite vo Makedonija.* Skopje: Logos-T.